

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,886	09/18/2001	Sanket S. Amberkar	DE3-0173/DP-302828	8234
7	/590 01/21/2005		EXAMINER	
EDMUND P. ANDERSON			BROADHEAD, BRIAN J	
DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES, INC. Legal Staff Mail Code: 480-414-420 P.O. Box 5052			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3661	
Troy, MI 480	007-5052		DATE MAILED: 01/21/2009	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•			P~				
	1.	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	Advisory Action	09/954,886	AMBERKAR ET AL.					
	Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Brian J. Broadhead	3661					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
	THE REPLY FILED 04 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
	a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
	b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
	Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.								
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:								
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);								
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);								
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or								
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.								
	NOTE:							
	3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):						
	<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment				
	5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
	6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly				
	7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims were appeared to the control of the control			and an				
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

Claim(s) allowed: 13-19,21 and 22.

Claim(s) objected to: 3-6,8,9,25-28 and 30-32. Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,7,10-12,20,23,24,29 and 33. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The argument that Yamamoto does not disclose "a steering -pull comepnsator responsive to a signal indicative of a valid detection cycle for modyigying said torque-assist command to the electric motor by an offset corresponding to a detected steering-pull condition" is not convining. Yamamoto discloses a system that accounts for a disturbance such as crosswinds that affect the steering operation by adjusting the steering torque similar to what is disclosed by the applicant and sufficient enough to read on the claims. Yamamoto discloses a system that adjusts the steering torque s the driver does not have to. In reference to the second argument, a valid detection cycle has been interpreted to be the detection of a lateral dynamic condition of the vehicle that spurs the response from the reaction computing unit. Applicant seems to have taken a much narrower interpretation of this limitation. If the Applicant wishes to more narrowly define this limitation it is suggested that the claims be amended to reflect this. The arguments with repsect to claims 5 and 27 are convinving and the rejections are withdrawn.